



Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 Office of Energy Projects
 Washington, DC 20426

Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project *Final Environmental Impact Statement*

Volume I



Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC
Dominion Energy Transmission, Inc.

Docket Nos. CP15-554-000, CP15-554-001, CP15-555-000, and CP15-556-000
 FERC/EIS-0274F

Cooperating Agencies:



**U.S. Department of
 Agriculture – Forest
 Service**



**US Army Corps
 of Engineers®**

**U.S. Army Corps of
 Engineers**



**U.S. Environmental
 Protection Agency**



**U.S. Fish and
 Wildlife Service**



**West Virginia
 Department of
 Environmental
 Protection**



**West Virginia
 Division of Natural
 Resources**

ACP are reduced or mitigated for, while maintaining the appeal of the area, as demonstrated by other residential and commercial developments in the area and similar projects throughout the country.

4.9.9 Environmental Justice

EO 12898, *Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, requires federal agencies to consider if impacts on human health or the environment (including social and economic aspects) would be disproportionately high and adverse for minority and low-income populations and appreciably exceed impacts on the general population or other comparison group. We received comments expressing concern that ACP and SHP pipeline and aboveground facilities were sited through areas with disproportionately high concentrations of low-income and minority populations, thus unduly impacting these environmental justice communities.

Consistent with EO 12898, the CEQ called on federal agencies to actively scrutinize the following issues with respect to environmental justice (CEQ, 1997a):

- the racial and economic composition of affected communities;
- health-related issues that may amplify project effects on minority or low-income individuals; and
- public participation strategies, including community or tribal participation in the process.

The EPA's Environmental Justice Policies focus on enhancing opportunities for residents to participate in decision making. The EPA (2011) states that Environmental Justice involves meaningful involvement so that: "(1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment and/or health; (2) the public's contributions can influence the regulatory agency's decision; (3) the concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision-making process; and (4) the decision-makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected."

In accordance with EO 12898, all public documents, notices, and meetings for ACP and SHP were made readily available to the public during our review of the project. Atlantic and DETI met with many different stakeholders during the initial development of the route, including local residents and affected landowners. These efforts involved several open houses with the affected communities and local authorities. Atlantic and DETI also established, and are maintaining, a project website to share project information with the public.

Atlantic and DETI also used the FERC's Pre-filing Process (see section 1.3). One of the major goals of this process is to increase public awareness and encourage public input regarding every aspect of the project (e.g., design, routing, environmental concerns and impacts) before an application is filed. As part of this process, FERC staff participated in several of Atlantic's and DETI's open houses and hosted several FERC scoping meetings to receive input from the public about ACP and SHP. Interested parties have had, and will continue to be given, opportunities to participate in the NEPA review process. To date, this included the opportunity to participate in the public scoping meetings within the project area to identify concerns and issues that should be covered in the EIS, and the opportunity to submit written comments about the projects to the FERC. Stakeholders will also have the opportunity to review this draft EIS and provide comments directly to the FERC staff in person (during scheduled comment sessions) or in writing.

4.9.9.1 Demographic and Economic Data

Based on published EPA guidance concerning environmental justice reviews (EPA, 1998), we used a three-step approach to conduct our review. These steps are:

1. Determine the existence of minority and low-income populations.
2. Determine if resource impacts are high and adverse.
3. Determine if the impacts fall disproportionately on environmental justice populations.

For the purposes of this review, a low-income population exists when the percentage of all persons living below the poverty level is more than the percentage for the state where the census tract is located. Also, for the purpose of this review, minority population exists when:

1. the total racial minorities in a U.S. Census Bureau-defined census tract (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013) are more than 50 percent of the tract's population;
2. the percentage of a racial minority in a census tract is "meaningfully greater"³⁰ than in the comparison group;
3. the total ethnic minorities in a census tract are more than 50 percent of the tract's population; or
4. the percentage of ethnic minorities in a census tract is meaningfully greater than in the comparison group.

Racial and ethnic minorities include: African American/Black, Native American or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, two or more races, and other races; and the Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

Appendix U provides an overview of the racial and economic characteristics of the population within the 136 unique census tracts within a 1-mile radius of all ACP and SHP facilities (this includes the pipeline, compressor stations, all aboveground facilities, and contractor yards). In West Virginia, minorities comprise 6.4 percent of the total population. The percentage of minorities in the West Virginia census tracts within 1 mile of ACP or SHP ranges from 0.1 to 6.9 percent. No census tracts within 1 mile of ACP or SHP have a minority population greater than 50 percent or meaningfully greater than that of the county in which it is located. In Virginia, minorities comprise 30.8 percent of the total population. The percentage of minorities in the Virginia census tracts within 1 mile of ACP ranges from 0.2 to 100 percent. In 15 of the 63 census tracts, the minority population is greater than 50 percent or meaningfully greater than that of the county in which it is located. In North Carolina, minorities comprise 30.5 percent of the total population. The percentage of minorities in the North Carolina census tracts within 1 mile of ACP ranges from 12.5 to 95.5 percent. In 20 of the 42 census tracts, the minority population is greater than 50 percent or is meaningfully greater than that of the county in which it is located. In Pennsylvania, minorities comprise 18.1 percent of the total population. The percentage of minorities in the Pennsylvania census tracts within 1 mile of SHP ranges from 0.1 to 42.8 percent. In one of the nine census tracts, the minority population is meaningfully greater than that of the county in which it is located.

To restate, for this analysis, a low-income population exists when the percentage of all persons living below the poverty level is greater than the percentage of persons below poverty level for the state

³⁰ "Meaningfully greater" is defined in this analysis when minority or ethnic populations are at least 10 percentage points more than in the comparison group, which was the county in which the census tract was located.

where the census tract is located. In West Virginia, 18.1 percent of all persons live below the poverty level. Nine of the 22 census tracts in West Virginia within a 1-mile radius of ACP and SHP project facilities have a higher percentage of persons living below the poverty level when compared to the state. In Virginia, 11.5 percent of all persons live below the poverty level. Thirty-four of the 63 census tracts in Virginia within a 1-mile radius of ACP facilities have a higher percentage of persons living below poverty-level when compared to the state. In North Carolina, 17.6 percent of all persons live below the poverty level. Twenty-seven of the 42 census tracts in North Carolina within a 1-mile radius of ACP facilities have a higher percentage of persons living below poverty-level when compared to the state. In Pennsylvania, 13.5 percent of all persons live below the poverty level. No census tracts within 1 mile of SHP project facilities have a low-income population meaningfully greater than that of the state.

We received numerous comments on the draft EIS expressing concern about minority and low-income communities near the proposed Compressor Station 2 in Buckingham County, Virginia. Using the methodology described above, we determined that the proposed Compressor Station 2 would be within a census tract that is designated a low-income environmental justice population. The two other census tracts within 1 mile of the proposed Compressor Station 2 are also designated low-income environmental justice populations. None of the three census tracts within 1 mile of the proposed Compressor Station 2 are designated minority environmental justice populations based on the methodology described above. The nearest residence to the proposed Compressor Station 2 is approximately 1,450 feet from the site.

The construction and operation of the proposed facilities would affect a mix of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic areas in the ACP and SHP project area. Not all impacts identified in this EIS are considered to affect minority or low-income populations. The primary adverse impacts on the environmental justice communities associated with the construction of ACP and SHP would be the temporary increases in dust, noise, and traffic from project construction. These impacts would occur along the entire pipeline route and in areas with a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds.

Due to the number of comments we received regarding environmental justice and specifically impacts resulting from increased air and noise emissions at the proposed Compressor Station 2, we have expanded our discussion of the potential for the risk of impacts to fall disproportionately on environmental justice communities. Risk is defined as the likelihood and probability for experiencing an impact, in this case negative health outcomes from adverse project impacts. The approach to determining disproportionality in this impact assessment was done by considering the risk for environmental justice populations to experience negative health outcomes that could result from increased air emissions and noise.

As discussed in section 4.11.1, air pollutants associated with ACP and SHP include increased dust as a result of construction equipment and vehicles, and compressor station emissions, which include carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, and nitrous oxide (NO_x); volatile organic compounds (VOCs); and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}). These air pollutants are known to increase the effects of asthma³¹ and may increase the risk of lung cancer (Nafstad et al., 2003).

Due to high rates of asthma within the overall African American community, we consider this community especially sensitive. Based on American Lung Association statistics, “African Americans have one of the highest rates of current asthma compared to other racial/ethnic groups” (American Lung

³¹ Asthma is a chronic disorder impacting the lung airways where periods of reversible airflow obstruction is experienced. Individuals experience asthma “episodes” or “attacks” from a variety of events including exercise, airway infections, airborne allergens, occupational exposures, and air pollutions such as particulate matter and VOCs. Asthma is incurable but controllable though appropriate medical care with medication and avoiding exposures to triggers for attacks (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013).

Association, 2010). Prevalence rates are consistently high between African Americans and Caucasians in all age groups (American Lung Association, 2010). African American, multi-race, and adult females aged 18-24 have the highest adult prevalence of asthma. Prevalence in children is highest in African Americans when compared to other racial/ethnic groups (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2013).

When considering the health impacts associated with compressor station emissions, increased rates of lung cancer were identified associated with the compounds emitted by compressor station operations (Nafstad et al., 2003). Studies have shown that several different cancer-related compounds and chemicals are present in the air in proximity to construction and operation of compressor stations, and that some of these have documented health effects on the general and vulnerable populations (Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project, 2015).

As noted previously, African American populations have a greater prevalence of asthma. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that, where African American populations exceed the thresholds for environmental justice populations identified in this analysis, those populations have an increased risk over Caucasian populations (and therefore disproportionate) of experiencing adverse effects from decreased air quality. Further, it is recognized that low income populations have greater risks associated with negative health outcomes (CDC, 2017).

The proposed new and modified compressor stations would be gas-driven; air quality impacts and mitigation measures associated with compressor station operation are discussed in section 4.11.1. Health risks related to ACP and SHP would be associated with an unanticipated pipeline or compressor station failure, gas leaks, and blowdowns at compressor stations. Section 4.12 describes the risks to public safety that could result from a pipeline failure and describes how applicable safety regulations and standards would minimize the potential for these risks. Because the projects would generally traverse rural areas, the number of persons who would be at risk of injury due to a pipeline failure would be low, and there is no evidence that such risks would be disproportionately borne by any racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group.

Atlantic and DETI would implement a series of measures that would minimize potential impacts on the nearby communities, including environmental justice communities near project facilities. For instance, Atlantic and DETI propose to employ proven construction-related practices to control fugitive dust, such as application of water or other commercially available dust control agents on unpaved areas subject to frequent vehicle traffic. Some individuals with extreme sensitivity to changes in air quality could be impacted by temporary fugitive dust during construction or air emissions from the compressor stations. However, not all individuals within the identified and surrounding environmental justice populations would be impacted.

Similarly, noise control measures would be implemented by Atlantic and DETI during construction and operation of the projects. Additionally, Atlantic and DETI (per their proposed mitigation measures and our additional recommendations) would ensure that the operational noise attributable to the new compressor stations and compressor station modifications would be less than 55 L_{dn} at nearby NSAs, and the increase in the overall noise due to the new stations would be below the threshold considered perceptible to the human ear at most NSAs.

Due to construction dust and compressor station emissions, African American populations near ACP and SHP could experience disproportionate health impacts due to their susceptibility to asthma. Health impacts from construction dust would be temporary, localized, and minor. Health impacts from compressor station emissions would be moderate because, while they would be permanent facilities, air emissions would not exceed regulatory permissible levels. As a result, no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice populations as a result of air quality impacts, including impacts associated with the proposed Compressor Station 2, would be expected as a result of ACP and SHP. Also,

no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice populations as a result of other resources impacts would be expected.

4.9.10 Socioeconomics on Federal Lands

ACP's AP-1 mainline would cross approximately 21.2 miles of NFS lands and 0.1 mile of NPS-owned land (associated with the BRP). Table 4.8.9-1 identifies the location and distance of crossings of ACP over federal lands.

The socioeconomic data for the counties crossed by ACP where federal lands are located (Pocahontas, West Virginia for the MNF; Highland, Bath, and Augusta Counties, Virginia for the GWNF; and Augusta and Nelson Counties, Virginia for the BRP) are presented in the tables throughout section 4.9. Information regarding specific recreational and special interest areas on federal lands are discussed in detail in section 4.8.9.

4.9.10.1 Recreation and Tourism

Potential visual impacts of ACP on federal lands as it relates to recreation are discussed in detail in section 4.8.9. There are a wide variety of recreational activities that take place on federal lands that would be crossed by ACP. As further described in section 4.8.9, we do not believe construction and operation of ACP would have a significant adverse effect on recreation on federal lands. There is a possibility of conflict between pipeline construction traffic and visitors using roads on federal lands, particularly during peak tourism season (see section 4.9.10.2). Additionally, due to the influx of non-local construction workers to the project area, there may be increased competition (and cost) for short-term housing, which may decrease housing availability for tourists and recreationalists near federal lands. However, given the sufficient amount of short-term housing available in the entire ACP and SHP project area and surrounding metropolitan statistical areas, we do not believe the construction of ACP would create a significant adverse impact on visitors looking for accommodations during trips to federal lands.

4.9.10.2 Transportation and Traffic

Pipeline construction would require the use of several existing roads and the construction of new access roads on FS land to access the pipeline right-of-way during construction and operation (see table 4.8.9-3). Access road construction activities would affect public access. To minimize and mitigate potential impacts, Atlantic would prepare spread-specific traffic and transportation management plans for managing vehicle traffic during construction of ACP, considering peak travel times, emergency services, and visitor traffic. The FS has stated traffic and transportation impacts on NFS lands cannot be fully assessed until spread-specific plans are provided.

4.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended, requires the FERC, as lead federal agency, and the cooperating agencies to consider the effect of their undertakings on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP and to afford the ACHP an opportunity to comment. Atlantic and DETI, as non-federal parties, provided us with information, analyses, and recommendations, in accordance with the ACHP's regulations for implementing section 106 at 36 CFR 800.2(a)(3), and the FERC's regulations at 18 CFR 380(f). The federal land managing agencies have obligations regarding cultural resources under other federal laws and regulations, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Antiquities Act of 1906, section 110 of the NHPA, the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

APPENDIX U

**RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND POVERTY STATISTICS FOR CENSUS
TRACTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE
AND SUPPLY HEADER PROJECT**

TABLE U-1

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
United States	314,107,084	73.8	12.6	0.8	5	0.2	4.7	2.9	16.9	26.2	\$26,714	15.6
ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE												
West Virginia	1,853,881	93.6	3.2	0.2	0.7	0	0.3	2	1.3	6.4	\$22,148	18.1
Harrison	69,069	95.8	1.7	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.1	1.3	1.4	4.2	N/A	N/A
CT 313	2,595	98.3	0.7	0	0	0	0.2	0.8	1	1.7	\$25,184	12.5
CT 314 ^c	2,860	94.7	0	0	1.5	0	0.3	3.5	0.3	5.3	\$20,998	15.5
Lewis	16,412	97.2	0.9	0	0.2	0.1	0	1.7	0.2	2.9	N/A	N/A
CT 9672 ^c	3,549	95.5	0	0	0.3	0	0	4.2	0	4.5	\$19,656	22
CT 9673	3,818	98.7	0.1	0	0	0.5	0	0.7	0	1.3	\$24,754	9.8
CT 9674	2,596	99.2	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.7	\$20,677	19.5
Pocahontas ^f	8,710	96.7	1.5	0.1	0	0	0	1.7	0.4	3.3	N/A	N/A
CT 9601.01 ^d	1,186	99.9	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.8	0.1	\$23,185	13
CT 9601.02	1,172	93.1	5.5	0	0	0	0	1.4	0	6.9	\$20,815	15.1
CT 9602 ^d	3,800	95.8	1	0	0	0	0	3.2	0.4	4.2	\$17,764	23
Randolph	29,446	97	1.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.7	3	N/A	N/A
CT 9659 ^c	4,087	97.2	1.8	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	\$18,578	16.1
CT 9664 ^d	5,579	98.8	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.9	0.2	1.2	\$23,344	12.4
CT 9665 ^d	4,541	96.9	2.8	0.1	0	0	0	0.2	0.1	3.1	\$15,620	21.7
Upshur	24,487	97.6	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.4	N/A	N/A
CT 9666 ^d	4,690	97.8	0	0.3	0	0	0	1.9	0	2.2	\$20,761	20.9
CT 9668	3,673	99.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	3.6	0.5	\$17,829	27.1
CT 9669	3,347	98.6	0	0	1.4	0	0	0	0	1.4	\$26,125	17.1
CT 9670	4,870	96.4	2.1	0	0	1	0	0.5	0	3.6	\$20,640	17.4
CT 9671	4,361	98.9	0	0	0	0	0	1.1	0	1.1	\$20,290	16.7
Virginia	8,185,131	69.3	19.3	0.3	5.8	0.1	2.2	3.1	8.4	30.8	\$31,329	11.5
Amelia ^e	12,764	72.5	24.9	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	1.4	0.9	27.5	N/A	N/A
CT 9301	6,697	71.3	26.1	0.2	0.2	0	0.7	1.4	1.4	28.6	\$30,589	10.8
Augusta ^f	73,707	93	4.1	0.3	0.6	0	1	1	2.3	7	N/A	N/A
CT 701 ^d	5,477	74.5	22.6	0	0.6	0	1.5	0.8	2.8	25.5	\$15,487	13.2
CT 702	3,666	90.9	0.8	0	0.3	0.1	7	0.8	9.4	9	\$28,977	12.4
CT 708	5,868	96.2	2.6	0	0.3	0	0	0.9	0.3	3.8	\$28,306	8.1
CT 709	4,822	94.9	3.4	0	0	0	0	1.7	1.5	5.1	\$27,757	9.9

TABLE U-1 (cont'd)

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
CT 711.01	4,163	93.7	3.2	0	0	0	1.1	2	1.5	6.3	\$26,220	18.7
CT 711.02	5,934	97.5	2.1	0.5	0	0	0	0	2	2.6	\$26,604	3.8
CT 712	5,876	93.6	3.8	0.1	1.2	0	0.3	1	0.4	6.4	\$27,698	7.3
Bath ^f	4,644	91.7	5.9	0	0	0	0	2.3	1.8	8.2	N/A	N/A
CT 9201 ^{c,d}	4,644	91.7	5.9	0	0	0	0	2.3	1.8	8.2	\$26,429	9.3
Brunswick	16,961	41.7	56.4	0.3	0	0	0.5	1.1	1.9	58.3	N/A	N/A
CT 9301	3,511	43.7	52.3	1.5	0	0	0	2.5	0	56.3	\$22,048	16.9
CT 9302.01	2,301	24	75.2	0	0.2	0	0.2	0.3	0.8	75.9	\$14,922	20.8
CT 9302.03 ^{c,d}	4,321	34.9	63.2	0	0	0	1.1	0.8	5.4	65.1	\$18,389	28.9
CT 9303	5,231	60.1	39.3	0	0	0	0.1	0.5	0.4	39.9	\$19,258	24.6
Buckingham	17,072	62.2	34.7	0	0.2	0	0.7	2.1	2	37.7	N/A	N/A
CT 9301.01 ^c	4,200	68.3	27.9	0	0	0	2.1	1.8	5.6	31.8	\$22,752	26.6
CT 9302.01	5,954	54.4	42.7	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.4	2	1.2	45.6	\$16,396	20.7
CT 9302.02 ^d	4,239	71.7	23.7	0	0.6	0	0.3	3.7	0.6	28.3	\$23,583	22.5
Cumberland	9,916	63.1	34.4	0.7	0	0	0	1.8	0.1	36.9	N/A	N/A
CT 9301	6,375	64.3	33.4	1.1	0	0	0	1.1	0	35.6	\$22,036	15.5
CT 9302	3,541	60.8	36.3	0	0	0	0	2.9	0.3	39.2	\$26,778	24
Dinwiddie	27,993	64.8	32.7	0.1	0.3	0	0.4	1.6	2.7	35.1	N/A	N/A
CT 8401	5,446	71.7	27.1	0	0.4	0	0	0.7	0.3	28.2	\$25,418	17.6
CT 9801	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
Greenville	11,911	38.2	59.7	0.4	0.4	0	0.4	1	2	61.9	N/A	N/A
CT 8801.01 ^c	4,253	41.8	57	0.5	0	0	0.3	0.4	1.3	58.2	\$20,532	18.4
CT 8802 ^c	4,391	37.6	60.9	0.1	1.1	0	0	0.3	0	62.4	\$20,473	21.5
Highland ^f	2,258	99.8	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.2	N/A	N/A
CT 9701 ^d	2,258	99.8	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.2	\$23,482	12.5
Isle of Wight ^e	35,518	71.4	23.4	0.1	1.1	0	1	3	2.3	28.6	N/A	N/A
CT 2804	3,773	84.2	15.6	0.2	0	0	0	0	0.5	15.8	\$24,411	13.2
Nelson ^f	14,892	83.6	13.6	0.2	0.4	0	1.6	0.5	3.3	16.3	N/A	N/A
CT 9501	5,588	79.7	18.7	0.3	0.7	0	0.1	0.5	1.3	20.3	\$25,272	19.8
CT 9502	4,965	90.2	7.2	0	0.6	0	1	1	2.8	9.8	\$30,657	6.9
CT 9503	4,339	81.1	14.5	0.2	0	0	4.1	0	6.5	18.8	\$23,182	15
Nottoway	15,756	56.4	39.4	0.3	0.3	0	2.1	1.6	3.9	43.7	N/A	N/A
CT 1	6,395	50.3	43.5	0.6	0.5	0	3.6	1.5	5.9	49.7	\$19,181	20.8

TABLE U-1 (cont'd)

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
CT 2	2,731	71.6	26.3	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	28.5	\$26,161	20.3
CT 3	6,620	56	40.6	0.2	0.2	0	1.2	1.8	3.3	44	\$20,084	21.3
CT 9801	10	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	-	0
Prince Edward	23,140	63.7	33.6	0.1	1.2	0	0.5	1	2.4	36.4	N/A	N/A
CT 9301	7,241	53.3	42.6	0	3.4	0	0.3	0.3	1	46.6	\$16,842	36
Rockbridge ^f	22,367	93.9	2.9	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.7	1.6	1.5	6.2	N/A	N/A
CT 9301 ^d	8,117	94.1	2.7	0	1.2	0.2	0	1.7	0.9	5.8	\$24,280	14.5
CT 9302	4,087	96.7	0.5	0	0.6	0	1.3	0.9	1.8	3.3	\$20,586	15.2
Southampton	18,364	61	36.3	0.3	0.1	0	0.3	2.1	1.3	39.1	N/A	N/A
CT 2004	6,298	61.4	36.2	0.3	0	0	0.7	1.4	1	38.6	\$27,520	16.4
CT 2005	3,516	53.1	42.7	0	0.5	0	0.1	3.7	0.3	47	\$22,512	13.3
Chesapeake, City of	228,168	62.5	29.8	0.3	3.2	0.1	1.1	2.9	4.9	37.4	N/A	N/A
CT 205	1,381	47.7	28.2	0	2.4	0	21.4	0.3	29.5	52.3	\$21,671	7.1
CT 206	4,240	82	15	0	0.3	0	0	2.7	7.1	18	\$29,805	7.3
CT 207	5,305	22.3	75.1	0	0	0	0	2.5	5.7	77.6	\$22,972	15.5
CT 209.03 ^c	2,588	26	70.5	0.2	1.8	0	0	1.5	4.7	74	\$32,525	9.9
CT 209.04	8,616	59.9	31.7	0	4.3	0	0.2	3.9	2.9	40.1	\$41,867	10.2
CT 209.05	2,753	78.7	17.1	0	3.9	0	0	0.3	12.5	21.3	\$34,107	7.7
CT 213.01	5,401	68.1	27.8	0.2	1.4	0.2	1.1	1.4	3.5	32.1	\$36,708	7.8
CT 213.02	9,740	59.1	33	0	2.1	0	1.2	4.5	5.8	40.8	\$42,722	6.5
CT 214.01	1,884	65.9	28.3	0.5	0	0	2.3	3	2.3	34.1	\$39,132	8.3
CT 214.02	6,534	75.2	19.7	0	1.8	0	0.2	3.2	0.9	24.9	\$34,986	10
CT 214.03	4,586	59.2	30.6	0.8	0	0	6.6	2.7	8.3	40.7	\$23,675	12.8
CT 214.04	7,620	22	75	0	1.5	0	1.4	0.2	6.7	78.1	\$26,045	14.9
CT 215.01	10,725	51.1	38.6	0.5	3.9	0	1.9	4.1	6.8	49	\$36,667	10.5
Franklin, City of	8,534	38.8	58	0	0.9	0	0.2	2.2	0.6	61.3	N/A	N/A
CT 901 ^d	4,830	60.4	35	0	1.4	0	0.3	3	1	39.7	\$26,535	7.7
CT 902	3,704	10.7	87.9	0	0.2	0	0	1.2	0	89.3	\$12,684	48.9
Suffolk, City of	85,477	52.3	41.9	0.1	1.4	0	0.6	3.8	3.3	47.8	N/A	N/A
CT 753.02	2,271	71.8	20.4	0.4	1	0	1.1	5.3	1.7	28.2	\$34,259	19.2
CT 754.02	4,117	53.7	40	0	0.8	0	1.6	4	6.8	46.4	\$44,191	5.2
CT 754.03	4,314	46	46	0	1.2	0	3.1	3.8	4.4	54.1	\$41,023	5.8
CT 754.04	971	90.7	9.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.3	\$41,773	1.3

TABLE U-1 (cont'd)

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
CT 754.05	2,192	92.5	6.9	0	0	0.4	0	0.2	0.5	7.5	\$36,129	1.7
CT 755.01	4,735	46.2	48.2	0	0.7	0	0.1	4.8	1.2	53.8	\$26,866	20.4
CT 755.02	4,370	51.8	40.5	0	5	0	0.7	2	2.3	48.2	\$36,964	7
CT 757.02	3,555	74.6	22.4	0	0	0	0	3	2.4	25.4	\$37,386	7.6
CT 757.03	1,344	70.3	29.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.7	\$26,313	4.9
CT 758.01	2,872	80.2	17.2	0.9	0.3	0	0.2	1.2	0.6	19.8	\$26,891	4.7
CT 758.02	1,677	53.5	44.1	0	1	0	0	1.4	0	46.5	\$24,979	7.9
CT 758.03	1,343	75.9	20.5	0	0	0	0	3.6	2.6	24.1	\$33,772	15.3
North Carolina	9,750,405	69.6	21.5	1.2	2.4	0.1	3	2.3	8.7	30.5	\$24,957	17.6
Cumberland	324,002	52	36.2	1.2	2.3	0.3	2.5	5.4	10.4	47.9	N/A	N/A
CT 14 ^d	6,038	47.7	45.4	3.1	0	0	0.3	3.5	5.4	52.3	\$20,906	23.6
CT 26 ^c	4,041	69	25.7	1.5	1.2	0	0.1	2.5	0.4	31	\$27,145	17.2
CT 27	8,742	69.8	20.7	0	2.3	0.4	2.5	4.3	6.3	30.2	\$28,829	8.2
CT 28	6,538	80.2	12.1	1.7	0.2	0.7	0.8	4.3	2.3	19.8	\$26,374	12.2
CT 29	4,639	67.3	24	1.3	1.8	0	0	5.7	5.6	32.8	\$26,484	17.1
CT 30.01	11,543	65	19.3	5.5	1.2	0	3.7	5.3	10.5	35	\$31,878	8.9
CT 30.02	2,789	69.2	24.1	3.4	0	0	1	2.3	9.5	30.8	\$25,432	13.4
CT 37	7,035	72.4	22.2	1.1	0.2	0	0	4.2	6.3	27.7	\$29,625	13.1
Halifax	53,803	40	51.6	3.3	0.8	0	0.9	3.4	2.4	60	N/A	N/A
CT 9306	4,085	36.4	57	0.7	1.2	0	1.2	3.5	2	63.6	\$17,943	26.6
CT 9308	5,667	8.3	51	29.3	1.2	0.1	1.6	8.5	3.4	91.7	\$15,304	29.7
CT 9309	5,026	9.1	88.6	0.1	1.6	0	0	0.7	0	91	\$13,533	34
CT 9310 ^d	3,285	25.4	67.1	1.3	0.2	0	0	6	1.1	74.6	\$18,516	17.3
CT 9301	3,272	24.4	73.8	0.1	0	0	0	1.7	0.3	75.6	\$14,967	40.2
Johnston	175,343	78.5	15.1	0.4	0.7	0	3.1	2.2	13.1	21.5	N/A	N/A
CT 401	6,263	85.5	13.2	0	0	0	0.9	0.4	8.8	14.5	\$22,975	22.8
CT 403.01	3,535	53.7	20.7	1.8	0	0	22.6	1.2	40	46.3	\$15,600	41.2
CT 404	4,335	82.6	10.5	0	0.1	0	6	0.7	16.7	17.3	\$22,165	20.3
CT 406 ^d	3,354	59.1	27.6	0	0.6	0	11.6	1.1	15.5	40.9	\$17,420	23.6
CT 407 ^c	3,399	60.9	27	0.2	7.1	0	2.5	2.2	6.4	39	\$18,182	18.3
CT 412.02	5,413	87.4	7.5	0.5	0.1	0	4.4	0	31.2	12.5	\$17,267	35.7
CT 413	5,686	76.8	14.7	0.4	0	0	3.9	4.2	9.4	23.2	\$20,622	23.1
CT 414	6,768	71	14.5	0	1	0	11.5	2.1	17.3	29.1	\$20,698	26.8

TABLE U-1 (cont'd)

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
Nash	95,174	55.1	37.8	0.7	0.8	0	3.4	2.3	6.4	45	N/A	N/A
CT 107	2,538	39.1	55.1	0	1.3	0	0	4.4	1.8	60.8	\$22,102	11.4
CT 108	7,087	79.1	20.2	0.3	0.1	0	0.2	0.2	0.8	21	\$30,743	9.9
CT 111.01	5,582	49.5	43.7	0	0	0	3	3.9	7.7	50.6	\$26,202	11.7
CT 111.02	7,647	65.8	29	3.2	0	0	0.9	0.9	1.6	34	\$22,013	19.1
CT 113	5,163	72.9	9.4	0	0	0	15.4	2.2	23.6	27	\$22,208	13.4
CT 114	4,748	52	27.9	0.5	0.4	0	18.1	1.1	24.6	48	\$23,612	18.1
Northampton	21,310	40.1	56.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	2.9	1.7	59.9	N/A	N/A
CT 9201	5,141	65.1	32.6	0	0	0	0	2.4	1.8	35	\$24,813	16.4
CT 9203 ^c	6,180	19.1	75.6	0.2	0.1	0	0	5.1	0.4	81	\$17,625	32.3
Robeson	134,913	30.8	24.1	37.6	0.8	0.1	3.8	2.9	8.1	69.3	N/A	N/A
CT 9601.01	4,057	54	34.4	5.3	0	0	4.1	2.1	22.1	45.9	\$17,859	43
CT 9601.02	4,970	54.9	21.5	16.7	0.5	0	2.5	3.8	9.3	45	\$17,449	23.3
CT 9602.01	5,879	46.4	30.7	16	0	0	2.9	4	5	53.6	\$19,557	22.5
CT 9602.02	4,446	22.5	9.8	58.5	0.9	0	4.4	3.9	19.6	77.5	\$18,844	33.1
CT 9603	7,167	36.6	35.9	22.1	0.3	0.5	2.2	2.3	20.7	63.3	\$16,283	43.8
CT 9604.01	7,782	9.1	2	82.4	0.7	0	0.6	5.2	0.7	90.9	\$17,623	36.3
CT 9604.02	3,654	11.2	7.3	73.9	1.3	0	4.3	2	5.8	88.8	\$19,864	29.4
CT 9605.01 ^c	3,612	4.5	9.3	81.3	0	0	0.2	4.7	0.7	95.5	\$17,737	32.3
CT 9606	6,920	16	10.9	67.3	1.1	0	4.1	0.7	6.5	84.1	\$17,718	29.8
CT 9607.01	6,253	22.4	6.1	54.2	1	0	12.7	3.5	20.2	77.5	\$19,694	36.3
Sampson	63,842	58.5	26	1.7	0.3	0	10.8	2.7	17.5	41.5	N/A	N/A
CT 9703.01	5,932	75.2	15.2	0.1	0.3	0	5.2	4.1	13.4	24.9	\$25,698	18.7
Wilson	81,499	51.1	38.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	6.9	2.1	9.8	49	N/A	N/A
CT 15	5,668	69.6	15.2	0	0.1	0	12.4	2.6	17	30.3	\$26,142	13.1
CT 16	3,179	69.2	20.4	1.1	0.4	0	8.8	0	8.8	30.7	\$26,047	17.6
SUPPLY HEADER PROJECT												
Pennsylvania	12,758,729	81.9	10.9	0.2	3	0	2	2	6.1	18.1	\$26,729	13.5
Greene	38,171	92.3	5.4	0.5	0.2	0	0.3	1.3	1.3	7.7	N/A	N/A
CT 9702	3,204	93.2	6.5	0	0.1	0	0	0.3	0.9	6.9	\$23,707	10.4
CT 9703 ^d	4,520	98.9	0.2	0	0.2	0	0.1	0.6	0.3	1.1	\$26,172	12.4
CT 9705.01	5,130	57.3	33.3	2.8	0.3	0.1	2.1	4.2	7.2	42.8	\$15,159	4.2

TABLE U-1 (cont'd)

Racial, Ethnic, and Poverty Statistics for Census Tracts Within 1 Mile of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project

Project/Location	Total population a	White (%) ^a b	Black or African American (%) ^a	American Indian and Alaska Native (%) ^a	Asian (%) ^a	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (%) ^a	Some other race (%) ^a	Two or more races (%) ^a	Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) (%) ^a	Total Minority Population (%) ^a	Median income (dollars) ^a	Percent Below Poverty Level (%) ^a
Westmoreland	362,587	95.1	2.3	0.1	0.9	0	0.2	1.3	1	4.8	N/A	N/A
CT 8017.02	4,607	99.9	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.3	0.1	\$32,063	4.2
CT 8017.03	2,750	99.8	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.2	\$24,167	4.3
CT 8019 ^d	6,605	95.6	1	0	1.1	0	0	2.2	0.3	4.3	\$25,504	4.7
CT 8020.01 ^c	2,562	96.1	1	0	2.5	0	0.1	0.4	0.8	4	\$29,909	3.1
CT 8020.02	7,673	94.8	0.7	0.2	3.3	0	0.1	1	1.2	5.3	\$31,727	6.6
CT 8021.02 ^c	6,048	96.5	0	0	1.8	0	0	1.6	3.2	3.4	\$37,182	5.7
West Virginia	1,853,881	93.6	3.2	0.2	0.7	0	0.3	2	1.3	6.4	\$22,148	18.1
Doddridge	8,282	97.2	0.9	0.1	0	0	0	1.8	1	2.8	N/A	N/A
CT 9650 ^d	3,906	97.8	0.4	0.3	0	0	0	1.6	0.7	2.3	\$19,244	11
Harrison	69,069	95.8	1.7	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.1	1.3	1.4	4.2	N/A	N/A
CT 314 ^c	2,860	94.7	0	0	1.5	0	0.3	3.5	0.3	5.3	\$20,998	15.5
Lewis	16,412	97.2	0.9	0	0.2	0.1	0	1.7	0.2	2.9	N/A	N/A
CT 9672 ^c	3,549	95.5	0	0	0.3	0	0	4.2	0	4.5	\$19,656	22
Marshall	32,716	97.8	0.9	0.3	0.4	0	0.2	0.5	0.9	2.3	N/A	N/A
CT 209	4,435	98.1	1.1	0.1	0.3	0	0	0.3	0	1.8	\$22,830	11.4
Ritchie	10,221	98.3	0.4	0	0	0	0	1.3	0.6	1.7	N/A	N/A
CT 9623 ^d	4,333	98.5	0.3	0	0	0	0	1.2	1.2	1.5	\$19,398	21
Tyler	9,084	98.8	0.2	0.1	0	0	0	0.8	0.6	1.1	N/A	18
CT 9620	2,161	99.4	0	0.4	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.7	\$18,830	16.8
Wetzel	16,314	98.6	0.1	0	0.5	0.1	0	0.7	0.6	1.4	N/A	N/A
CT 304	2,936	99.5	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.3	0.5	0.5	\$18,190	24.6
CT 305 ^{c, d}	4,251	98.6	0	0	0.6	0.3	0	0.5	0	1.4	\$19,390	23.6

Sources:

^a U.S. Census Bureau 2014.^b White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino^c Census tract contains permanent aboveground facility.^d Census tract contains contractor yard.^e Includes census tracts within one mile of the proposed pipeline facilities and major aboveground facilities, but does not contain any project facilities.^f Counties with federal lands crossed by the projects.

Grey highlighted values indicate percentage exceeds thresholds defined in text, and is an environmental justice population.